

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed on March 26, 2008, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 43-54 are now pending in this Application. Claims 43 and 54 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claims 19-29, 37, 38 and 40-42 have been cancelled. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

1. Rejection of Originally Submitted Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 43, 48-50 and 52-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,438,578, (hereinafter Schmid). Applicants respectfully disagree since Schmid does not teach Applicants' steps of **intercepting an initial request and transmitting redirection information to a requesting device...prior to the initial request for initial content made by the requesting device arrives at an intended destination**, as recited in independent claims 43 and 54.

Schimd discloses format and request instructions (hereinafter "FRIs") sent back to a network client that is sending requests for requested information. Specifically, when the requested information source receives the request originating from the network client, a reply is sent from the requested information source back to the network client. The reply includes the requested information desired by the network client. As the reply is sent to the network client, the reply is transferred to a transmission means that also sends FRIs to the network client. The FRIs can cause the network client to request supplemental information from a supplemental information source. (See Abstract, Col. 5, Lines 59 – Col. 6, Lines 56)

Here, in the rejection, Examiner asserts that Scmid's transmission of FRIs to the network client discloses Applicants' **transmission of redirection**

**information to a requesting device.** However, Schmid transmits the FRIs after the requested information source sends its reply to the network client's request. Thus, Schmid does not **transmit redirection information** (i.e. FRIs) to the requesting network client **prior to an initial request for initial content arrives at an intended destination.** In other words, Schmid does not teach sending the FRI's to the network client before the network client's request reaches the requested information source.

Moreover, the interception disclosed in Schmid is unrelated to the **transmission of redirection information to a requesting device.** Specifically, Schmid's ad insertion machine intercepts packets from the Internet, where the packets are generally requests for requested information and supplemental information. (See Col. 9, Line 65 – Col. 10, Line 26) Since requests for supplemental information are intercepted, the **redirection information** (i.e. FRIs) has already been transmitted to a network client – thereby causing the network client to send the request for supplemental information that gets intercepted. Schmid's interception thereby occurs after FRI's have been transmitted to the network client. Thus, instead of **intercepting an initial request for content to transmit redirection information to a requesting device**, Schmid intercepts requests that were generated by the network client in response to already transmitted **redirection information** (i.e. FRIs)

For the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that independent claims 43 and 54 are patentably distinct and advantageous over the cited references. In addition, by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 43, those claims which depend from claim 43 are patentably distinct from Schmid as well. Hence, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of Originally Submitted Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 44-47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid in view of Bandera et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,332,127, (hereinafter Bandera). However, Bandera fails to make up for the deficiencies of Schmid with regard to independent claim 43. In particular, Schmid and Bandera, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of independent claim 43. To that end, rejected claims 44-47, by virtue of their dependence on independent claim 43, are patentably distinct over the cited references as well. Hence, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of Originally Submitted Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 51 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmid in view of Subramaniam. However, Subramaniam fails to make up for the deficiencies of Schmid with regard to independent claim 43. In particular, Schmid and Subramaniam, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of independent claim 43. To that end, rejected claim 51, by virtue of dependence on independent claim 43, is patentably distinct over the cited references as well. Hence, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of Originally Submitted Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 19-29, 37 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau, U.S. Patent No. 6,505,240, in view of Merriman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,948,061, (hereinafter Merriman) and further in view of Thompson et al., U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002|0077900, (hereinafter Thompson). In addition, claims 40-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau in view of Merriman, Thompson and further in view of Subramaniam et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,081,900,

-11-

(hereinafter Subramaniam). Since claims 19-29, 37, 38 and 40-42 have been canceled, withdrawal of the rejection is hereby requested.

In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome, placing the pending claims in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/RVF/

Rajesh V. Fotedar, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No.: 59,562  
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC  
Westborough Office Park  
1700 West Park Drive  
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581  
Telephone: (508) 616-9660  
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS01-05(3847)

Dated: May 27, 2008